Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement drawing sheets make changes to Figs. 15, 19, 26 and 28 and

replace the original sheets with Figs. 15, 19, 26 and 28.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-18 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 7-9 and 18 are amended and claim 6 is canceled. In addition, the title is amended and typographical errors in the drawings are corrected. Independent claim 1 is amended to incorporate the features previously recited in dependent claim 6. Claims 7, 8 and 18 are amended in view of the cancellation of claim 6, and claim 9 is amended to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101. Thus, no new matter is added by the above amendments.

I.   Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner is requested to consider the information submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement that was filed on January 31, 2006. The Examiner is requested to return an initialed PTO-1449 with the next Patent Office communication.

II.   All Informalities Have Been Corrected

The Office Action identified a typographical error in Fig. 15. By this Amendment, that typographical informally and additional typographical informalities in the drawings have been corrected. In particular: (i) the spelling of "deleting" and "protected" in step S521 of Fig. 15 is corrected; (ii) the spelling of "termination" in step S22 of Fig. 19 is corrected; (iii) the spelling of "selection" in step S61 and "search" in step S69 of Fig. 26 is corrected; and (iv) the spelling of "enabling" in step S81, "changed" in step S86, "lapse of time" in step S88 and "change" in step S94 of Fig. 28 is corrected.

Applicant submits that the amendment to the title overcomes the objection to the title.

III.   All Pending Claims Are Patentable

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to a computer program. Applicant submits that the amendments to claim 9 overcome this rejection in that claim 9 now is directed to a storage medium that stores a computer program. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,477,264 to Sarbadhikari et al. This rejection is moot in view of the amendment to claim 1 that incorporated the features of claim 6 into claim 1.

The rejection of claims 2, 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sarbadhikari et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,059 to Fichtner and the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sarbadhikari et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,099 to Davison et al. also are moot in view of the incorporation of the claim 6 features into claim 1. Withdrawal of these rejections is requested.

Claims 6-10 and 14-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sarbadhikari et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,001 to Berstis. This rejection (as it also might be applied to amended claim 1) is respectfully traversed.

Neither Sarbadhikari et al. nor Berstis discloses or suggests the combinations of features recited in independent claims 1, 9 and 10, in which a digital camera coupled to a docking station transmits only the digital data of images, but not other digital data, from the memory of the digital camera to a digital image storage (as recited in independent claims 1 and 9) or to the storage medium of an image storage (as recited in independent claim 10). Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's assertion that Sarbadhikari et al. discloses that "the computer does not download the enhancement files that are no [sic-not] required by the computer ...." See page 4, lines 1-4 of the Office Action. Sarbadhikari et al. discloses a memory card 24 that can be selectively coupled to either a camera or a computer and that stores image data files of images taken by the digital camera and non-image files (called enhancement data files) for use by the camera and the computer. See, for example, col. 6, lines 40-66 of Sarbadhikari et al. Sarbadhikari et al. explicitly discloses that when the memory card is coupled to the computer, the computer checks to see if there are any software enhancements stored on the memory card 24 "which can be used by the computer" and then

"if the card does contain appropriate 'software enhancements', however, these are downloaded from the card [the memory card 24] to the RAM instruction memory 9a [of the computer] ...." See col. 8, lines 6-17 of Sarbadhikari et al. As described at col. 8, lines 36-39, this process "eliminates the need for a separate means of supplying the code [to the computer], such as the floppy disk." Also see col. 4, lines 20-23, which discusses the prior art practice of providing software updates to the computer via a separate floppy disk. Sarbadhikari et al. thus discloses the opposite of what Applicant is claiming in this application. That is, Sarbadhikari et al. discloses that "enhancement data files" (which can be non-image files) existing in the memory card 24 are transmitted to the computer; Sarbadhikari et al. does not disclose or suggest an arrangement in which "only the digital data of the images, but not the other digital data, from the memory of the digital camera" is transmitted to the image storage.

While the Office Action also cites col. 11, lines 14-42 of Sarbadhikari et al., this portion of Sarbadhikari et al. discloses an arrangement in which a separate floppy disk is used to download enhancement files to the computer, not an arrangement in which only digital data of images, but not other digital data, existing in the memory of a digital camera is transmitted from the digital camera to an image storage (such as a computer). See, for example, col. 11, lines 26-30 of Sarbadhikari et al. In this embodiment of Sarbadhikari et al., the enhancement files are transmitted from the computer to the digital camera for temporary use by the digital camera, and are not stored in the digital camera memory that contains the image data.

Berstis also does not disclose or suggest an arrangement in which only the digital data of images, but not other digital data, present in the memory of a digital camera is transmitted to an image storage while the digital camera is coupled to the image storage via a docking station. Rather, Berstis discloses that image data and text data existing in the digital camera are transferred to the external computer. See, for example, col. 4, lines 53-60 of Berstis.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 9 and 10, along with their dependent claims, are patentable over Sarbadhikari et al. and Berstis. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sarbadhikari et al. in view of Berstis, and further in view of Fichtner. Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sarbadhikari et al. in view of Berstis, and further in view of Davison. These rejections are respectfully traversed. Claims 11-13 are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 10 from which they depend. Withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

IV.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

MAC/ccs

Attachments:
    Replacement Sheets
    Petition for Extension of Time

Date: March 27, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461